

**3rd Meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee  
held at 2:30 pm on 9 September 2004  
at 3/F, 3 Edinburgh Place, Central, Hong Kong**

**Minutes of Meeting**

**Present**

Professor Lee Chack-fan	Chairman
Mr Paul Zimmerman	Representing Business Environment Council ("BEC")
Mr Leung Kong-yui	Representing Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong
Dr Ng Mee-kam	Representing Citizen Envisioning@Harbour ("CE@H")
Dr Kwok Ngai-kuen, Alvin	Representing Conservancy Association
Mrs Mei Ng	Representing Friends of the Earth
Mr Vincent Ng	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Architects
Mr Leslie H C Chen	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects
Mr Kim O Chan	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Planners
Mr Chan Kowk-fai, Bernard	Representing Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors
Mr Louis H B Loong	Representing Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong
Mr Hardy Lok	Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour Limited ("SPH")
Mr Charles Nicholas Brooke	
Dr Chan Wai-kwan	
Professor Jim Chi-yung	
Mr Kwok Chun-wah, Jimmy	
Professor Lam Kin-che	
Mr Lau Hing-tak, Patrick	
Ms Lee Wai-king, Starry	
Mrs Rita Lau	Permanent Secretary for Housing, Planning and Lands (Planning and Lands)
Mr Thomas Chow	Deputy Secretary (Transport) <sup>1</sup> for the Environment, Transport and Works
Mr Bosco Fung	Director of Planning
Mr Tsao Tak-kiang	Director of Civil Engineering and Development
Mr Lau Ka-keung	Deputy Commissioner for Transport/Planning and Technical Services
Mr Li Pak-chuen, Patrick	Assistant Director of Home Affairs
Miss Christine Chow	Secretary

### **In Attendance**

Mr Thomas Tso	Deputy Secretary (Planning and Lands)1, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr Andrew Cheung	Assistant Secretary (Planning)2, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Ms Portia Yiu	Assistant Secretary (Planning)4, Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau
Mr L T Ma	Project Manager/Hong Kong Island and Islands, Civil Engineering and Development Department (“CEDD”)
Mr Talis Wong	Chief Engineer/Kowloon (2), CEDD
Mr Raymond Lee	District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (“PlanD”)
Mr Raymond Wong	Chief Town Planner/Sub-Regional Planning Section, PlanD

### **For item 4**

Mr Anthony Loo	Deputy Head (Port and Land), CEDD
Mr Lee Wai-ping	Senior Engineer/Research, CEDD
Mr Maurice Lee	Maurice Lee and Associates Limited

### **Absent with Apologies**

Ir Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan	Representing Hong Kong Institution of Engineers
Mrs Aliana Ho	Representing Hong Kong Tourism Board
Mr Chan Tak-chor	
Mr Chan Yiu-fai, Steve	
Mr Wu Man-keung, John	

### **Action**

#### **Welcoming Message**

**The Chairman** welcomed all Members to the third meeting of the Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (“HEC”).

#### **Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting**

1.1 **The Chairman** noted that the Secretary had circulated to Members the draft minutes of the second HEC meeting held on 8 July 2004, and no written suggested amendments had been received. He went on to ask if Members had any further

amendments/comments to make.

1.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** proposed the following amendments to the draft minutes –

- (a) On paragraphs 2.18, 7.1 and 7.4, the “Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review” should be added to the “Action” column;
- (b) On the 7<sup>th</sup> line of paragraph 8.2, the word “submissions” should be replaced by “presentations”; and
- (c) On paragraph 8.2, to add “Dr Andrew Thomson cautioned to make sure that there was a clear process for entertaining presentations from private firms. The BEC was not against submissions from private firms which had the same rights as every member of the public, and the BEC’s concern was to ensure a quality process for managing the presentation of submissions and how the HEC managed its precious meeting time well” at the end of the paragraph.

1.3 **Mr Hardy Lok** recalled that he had requested for information on some completed traffic studies during the second meeting following Mr Lau Ka-keung’s presentation. **The Secretary** undertook to revise the minutes.

**Secretary**

(Post-meeting notes: Confirmed minutes of the second meeting were uploaded to the HEC website on 27 September 2004.)

## **Item 2 Matters arising**

### **A. Membership and terms of reference (“ToR”) of the HEC and its Sub-committees**

2.1 **The Chairman** noted that three Sub-committees had been set up under the HEC and thanked Members for their participation in the Sub-committees. He congratulated Dr Chan Wai-kwan, Mr Vincent Ng and Mr Leung Kong-yui for taking up the chairmanship of the Sub-committees on South East Kowloon

Development (“SEKD”) Review, Harbour Plan Review and Wan Chai Development Phase II (“WDII”) Review respectively.

2.2 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said his understanding was that since he represented a member organization, if he could not chair a Sub-committee meeting, Members would need to elect among themselves a Member to preside at the meeting. **The Chairman** confirmed that his understanding was correct.

2.3 **The Meeting** noted and endorsed the memberships and ToRs of the HEC and its Sub-committees.

**B. Submission by the BEC on the proposed operating methodology for the work of the HEC and Sub-committees**

2.4 **The Chairman** thanked the BEC for its views. However, he noted that the ToRs of the three HEC Sub-committees had already been agreed at the first meetings of the Sub-committees. He invited the Chairmen of the Sub-committees to further discuss the ToRs as necessary.

**Chairmen**  
**of the three**  
**Sub-**  
**committees**

2.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the priority of the HEC should be to map out the harbour planning principles and the Harbour Plan. The principles and guidelines of the Harbour Plan should apply to the harbour-front areas, and serve to guide the harbour-front enhancement works. He commented that the HEC Secretariat should have worked out a table summarizing the BEC’s views on the ToR and the alternatives recommended.

2.6 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** noted that the BEC submission covered integrated planning of the harbour-front areas. He considered that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review would be an appropriate forum to follow up on the matter. Towards this end, he understood that the Sub-committee had already formed a task group to review the Harbour Plan principles.

2.7 In response, **Mr Vincent Ng** said that a number of harbour planning issues had been discussed at the first meeting of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review. The BEC, CE@H and Designing Hong Kong Harbour District had all proposed their own harbour planning principles that would be further

**Sub-**

examined by a dedicated task group with Dr Andrew Thomson as the Convenor. Mr Ng confirmed that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review would discuss the BEC's submission and report the outcome of the discussion to the HEC.

**committee  
on Harbour  
Plan Review**

2.8 **Mrs Mei Ng** believed that the HEC should have three roles – (a) to serve as a bridge between the community and the Government; (b) to monitor the planning process of the harbour-front; and (c) to coordinate planning proposals by the Government, the business sector and the community. Instead of being confined by a set of planning principles, the HEC should have an open mind and be ready to listen to the public's views.

2.9 **The Chairman** trusted that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review would further deliberate on the principles before reporting the outcome to the HEC. In response, **Mr Bosco Fung** said that a number of issues had already been discussed by the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review. The Sub-committee should have no difficulty in putting all these views together to formulate a revised set of harbour planning principles.

**Sub-  
committee  
on Harbour  
Plan Review**

2.10 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that an integrated approach should be adopted by the HEC and that the harbour-front should be developed with a fresh angle. The last thing he wished to see was harbour planning being led by individual road projects.

2.11 **Mr Zimmerman** further questioned whether all HEC Members were equal, whether the minutes and press releases reflected the actual discussions, and whether the Secretariats of the HEC and its Sub-committees were independent and neutral in discharging their duties.

2.12 In response, **the Chairman** assured Mr Zimmerman that all Members of the HEC were equal. Take voting rights as an example, every Member had an equal vote and this right was extended to the co-opted Members in the Sub-committees according to the proposed house rules. He assured Mr Zimmerman that there would not be any "secondary" membership in the HEC.

2.13 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** commented that the HEC could only function properly if Members had trust in each other. **Mr**

**Vincent Ng** agreed.

2.14 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed concern on the operating procedures of the HEC and suggested that house rules should be set for the issuance of the HEC press releases. He noticed that the press release issued after the second meeting of 8 July 2004 had been amended. He suggested that in future, the draft press release should be discussed by HEC Members prior to issue.

2.15 In response, **the Secretary** said that the press release issued after the meeting of 8 July 2004 was amended upon comments proposed by some Members. In future, the press release would be cleared by the HEC Chairman before it was issued. **Members** raised no objection to this arrangement.

**Secretary**

### **C. House rules for the HEC and its Sub-committees (Paper No. 9/2004)**

#### **1. Submissions and requests for presentation from the private sector**

2.16 **The Chairman** invited Members to consider whether the HEC should entertain submissions and requests for presentation from the private sector. On this, he had an informal meeting with the Chairmen of the Sub-committees. He was concerned that if the HEC were to entertain such requests, it would become a lobbying ground for submissions which later had to be processed and considered by a statutory authority such as the Town Planning Board (“TPB”). Furthermore, agreement to receive all private submissions would have a serious implication on the workload of HEC Members and the Secretariat. He suggested that he and the Sub-committee Chairmen should meet with the Chairman of the TPB to exchange views on the working relationship between the two organizations.

**Secretary**

2.17 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that instead of spending time to process such private submissions, the HEC should focus on reaching out to the community for views on harbour planning and development.

2.18 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the HEC should

welcome and receive all ideas related to harbour planning, but could exercise discretion on whether or not to entertain presentations from all individuals or organizations. A format should be posted onto the HEC website to facilitate public submissions of views/proposals. On this, **the Chairman** noted that the Secretary had made it a practice to compile a list of all submissions received for Members' information.

2.19 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that he found no justifications for the HEC to refuse such submissions. Otherwise, the HEC would be shut off from the major developments along the harbour-front. **Mr Hardy Lok** agreed.

2.20 **Professor Lam Kin-che** remarked that the issue should be looked at from the following angles –

- (a) Purpose – He believed that the HEC should look at “big and important issues” of harbour planning such as the main development principles instead of micro issues such as submissions from the individuals/organizations.
- (b) Principle – Considering that the HEC should aim to foster a partnership and cooperation among different interest groups on harbour planning issues, the HEC should open its ears to all proposals on the enhancement of the harbour-front.
- (c) Efficiency – He cautioned, however, that given the time constraints, the HEC should focus on the macro and more important issues.
- (d) Case by case approach – If there are issues worthy of further consideration, the HEC might decide to further examine individual submissions by merits.

2.21 **The Chairman** said that while the HEC and its Sub-committees should be open to proposals and ideas, we had to carefully consider whether the HEC should allow proponents to present their ideas at the HEC meetings, given that the meetings were already very lengthy.

2.22 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the HEC should be kept informed of the present land use along the harbour-front, the limitations and development opportunities in order to be best equipped to advise on how the harbour-front could be enhanced. A database of such information should be kept and made accessible by the public. In response, **the Chairman** said that PlanD would give a presentation on the land uses along the

**Plan D**

harbour-front under agenda item 3, and a regular update of the presentation materials could serve as the basis of such a database.

2.23 **Mrs Mei Ng** reiterated that the HEC should reach out to the community to listen to their views on harbour planning. She suggested that the Sub-committees should screen and then recommend important views received to the HEC for further discussion. Separately, the HEC should organize an open forum at least once a year to listen to how the public would wish the harbour-front should be enhanced.

2.24 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that there were pros and cons on whether the HEC should entertain private submissions. If the HEC decided not to receive private submissions, it might shut itself off from good suggestions. On the other hand, it would be difficult to stop private firms from exploiting “endorsement by the HEC” to their benefits. To strike a balance, he suggested that private submissions could be made to the HEC but the proponents should not be allowed to present their submissions at the meetings of the HEC. **Mrs Mei Ng** shared Dr Chan’s concern and said that the HEC should devote resources to listening to the community’s views.

2.25 **Dr Alvin Kwok** was also concerned that the good will of the HEC to entertain private submissions/presentations might be exploited by private firms to their own benefits. He suggested the following criteria for the HEC to consider whether a submission should be entertained or not –

- (a) A submission directly related to commercial interests should not be entertained.
- (b) Consideration should be given to the priorities of the HEC’s work schedule and agenda.
- (c) All proponents, be they private firms, organizations or individuals, should declare interests when making such submissions.

2.26 **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that a working group should be formed under the HEC to liaise with the TPB and to work out a mechanism in handling these private submissions.

2.27 **The Chairman** made the following concluding remarks –

- (a) He agreed with Mrs Mei Ng that the HEC should reach out to



the community. He pointed out that the HEC had always welcomed public suggestions on how the harbour-front could be enhanced. In fact, the HEC would meet with the four District Councils on Hong Kong Island on 5 November 2004 to listen to their views on harbour related issues. This would be the first step to reach out to the community.

- (b) An understanding should be worked out with the TPB to deal with planning applications/proposals in an efficient manner.
- (c) The Secretary should arrange a meeting for the three Sub-committee Chairmen and himself with the Chairperson, Vice Chairman and the Secretary of the TPB to further discuss the issue. There was no need to set up a working group to examine the issue at this stage.

Secretary

## 2. Co-option system

2.28 In response to the Chairman's invitation for comments on the co-option system, **Mrs Mei Ng** said that the proposed ceiling of six co-opted Members for each Sub-committee might pre-empt the Sub-committees from co-opting members in future. **The Chairman** replied that the size of the Sub-committees was an important consideration and that there was no need to fill up all the places in one go. **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed. **Mr Paul Zimmerman** remarked that he would accept members being co-opted in their personal capacities.

2.29 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that the purpose of the co-option system was to solicit expert advice on particular issues. As such, he considered that experts' views could be invited as and when necessary, instead of formalizing the arrangement through the co-option system. **Mrs Mei Ng** agreed that this would provide more flexibility. **Mr Vincent Ng** suggested that the Sub-committees should be given discretion to decide whether they needed the co-option system. **Members** agreed.

The three  
Sub-  
committees

## 3. Whether projects completing the due process should be entertained

2.30 On the issue of whether projects that had completed the due process of project authorization and funding approval for construction works should be discussed further by the HEC or any of its Sub-committees, **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the HEC should be allowed to discuss all projects, irrespective of

their state of play. In response, **Mr Thomas Tso** said that the approved public works projects could not be stopped or suspended or else the progress of the works would be seriously hampered and that substantial financial implications would be incurred. Nevertheless, the HEC could be briefed on the progress of these projects by the relevant Government departments.

2.31 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that he did not mean to stop or suspend the works projects. He only wanted to ensure that the Government would listen to suggestions that could improve the works, in view of the changing circumstances. He suggested that the cost and benefit analysis of any alternative proposals could be worked out for comparison purpose. **Mr Hardy Lok** agreed, saying that there should be room for improvement even for works projects that had completed the tendering process and that the HEC should be allowed to express its suggestions in this regard.

2.32 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said that works projects that had completed the statutory procedures should not be re-opened for discussion. However, the HEC should be briefed on the progress of the works projects.

2.33 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed that the HEC should not stop works projects, the funding of which had been approved by the Legislative Council's ("LegCo") Finance Committee. Neither should the HEC's discussions overrule those decisions. We had to draw a clear line between discussing and influencing the projects per se.

2.34 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** said that the HEC had to exercise great care in considering whether or not it should discuss such works projects, and be mindful of the loss in public fund if the works were delayed and the claims arising from it.

2.35 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that it was up to the Government to decide whether to stop or suspend any works projects and if any claims would arise as a result. He believed that the HEC should discuss the land use proposed for the newly reclaimed land which should not affect the works projects. Understanding that changes in land use might lead to possible reduction of public revenue in land sales, he agreed not to discuss further if Members

saw that as a damage to public interests.

2.36 **Mr Thomas Chow** said that public works projects that had secured the required policy and funding approval would have had undergone extensive public consultation at various stages prior to implementation. Support from the community gathered in the public consultation stages should be respected.

2.37 **The Chairman** said that he supported keeping the HEC closely informed of progress of the works projects that had completed the due process of project authorization and funding approval for construction works. He cautioned, however, that proposing any changes to such projects might give rise to claims by contractors. He felt that a responsible Government had to consider the likely financial implications involved in prolonging the original work schedule because of changes made and strike a balance in deciding how best the public interests could be met.

#### 4. Declaration of interests

2.38 On declaration of interests, **the Chairman** said that a simple declaration system should suffice. The elaborate system adopted by statutory bodies such as the TPB should not apply to the HEC. Upon invitation by the Chairman, **the Secretary** introduced Annex C of Paper 9/2004 on declaration of interests, which recommended that a simple “one-tier” declaration system should be applied to the HEC Chairman and Members. **Mr Thomas Tso** supplemented that a Member should make a declaration prior to the discussion of a particular agenda item if he/she felt that there would be a conflict of interests. **Members** agreed that the system should apply to the HEC and its Sub-committees.

HEC and  
Sub-commit  
tee  
Secretaries

2.39 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that Members would need to apply their conscience in making such declarations. **The Chairman** agreed.

### **Item 3 PowerPoint Presentation on Major Existing and Proposed Land Uses along the Victoria Harbour Harbour-Front**

3.1 With the Chairman’s permission, **Mrs Rita Lau** said

that she would like to set out for the information of the HEC the facts regarding Central Reclamation Phase III (“CRIII”) in response to the newspaper supplement placed by the SPH. She said that the Government had reaffirmed many times that apart from CRIII and the proposed reclamation schemes at WDII and SEKD, there would be no further reclamation inside the Harbour. The WDII and SEKD reclamation proposals were being reviewed to ensure full compliance with the Court of Final Appeal’s (“CFA”) “overriding public need test” and the HEC had set up two Sub-committees to advise on the reviews. The plans used by the SPH in the newspaper supplement were out-dated and contained information that was factually incorrect. Comprehensive and detailed factual information could be found in the Government website “Our Harbour Front”. She went on to explain that the Court had ruled that the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan (“OZP”) was legal and valid, and that the Government’s detailed engineering review had demonstrated that CRIII met the CFA’s test and that the reclamation extent was the minimum. The CRIII project had gone through the due process prior to commencement of works. She looked forward to working closely with Members and with the HEC providing a platform for thoughts and discussions on harbour planning as well as a medium for the community to be better acquainted with the harbour related works projects.

3.2 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** expressed surprise that the “media battle” between the Government and the SPH should be brought to the HEC meeting. He thanked the SPH for its work done to stop reclamation and save the harbour in the past two years and regretted the need for a High Court judgment which now made the work of enhancing the harbour-front extremely difficult, as even the piling for piers was considered reclamation. He appreciated the work of the SPH in exploring an alternative plan on the land use of CRIII. The 3-D presentation helped viewers to visualize the future developments planned there. He noted that the SPH had taken the initiative to submit a re-zoning application to the TPB.

3.3 **Mr Hardy Lok** said that the SPH’s intention was to protect the harbour. The SPH had submitted to the TPB a rezoning request on the Central OZP and he would welcome the Government’s view on the submission. He suggested that the SPH present its submission to the HEC at its next meeting.

**Secretary**

3.4 In response to comments made by Mr Zimmerman and Mr Lok, **Mrs Rita Lau** said that it was necessary to clarify the facts relating to CRIII so that the public would not be misled by incorrect and out-dated information. She believed that the HEC should adopt a forward-looking attitude in enhancing the harbour-front. On the SPH's rezoning request, she said that the request would be processed by the TPB in accordance with the established practice.

3.5 **The Chairman** thanked the Government for clarifying the facts on CRIII. Also, he believed that the TPB would handle the SPH's rezoning request in accordance with the relevant procedures.

3.6 **The Chairman** invited Mr Raymond Wong to brief Members on the major existing and proposed land uses along the harbour-front of Victoria Harbour with a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation gave an overview of the history and evolution of the harbour, the existing harbour-front land uses on both sides of Victoria Harbour and the future land uses.

3.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that he felt deeply that over the past decades, the Government had adopted an engineering-led approach in the planning of harbour-front developments. With such an approach, the priority had been to reserve sufficient space along the waterfront for infrastructural and road developments. He said that this should be avoided and that an integrated and holistic approach in strategic planning of the harbour-front should be adopted in the future.

3.8 **Mr Vincent Ng** agreed that harbour planning in the past was too fragmented and "district-oriented", and fell short of a holistic perspective. He supported adopting an integrated approach.

3.9 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** noted the Government's conventional approach of consulting the community with its formulated proposals. Given the strong aspiration for a new approach in deciding how best the harbour-front should be used, he supported an integrated approach with "genuine" public participation. In the process, the HEC should play a key role and be kept informed of and consulted on every new

**Sub-  
committee  
on Harbour**

development proposal such as the location and number of cruise terminals, yachting and convention facilities along the harbour-fronts. On PlanD's presentation, while he understood that it was prepared in response to Mr Chan Tak-chor's request, he did not feel that it had addressed issues such as the land fill barging point in Western District. Nor had it set out the role of the HEC in advising the Government on measures that were needed to ensure that harbour-front enhancement objectives and principles were followed. He suggested that a regular item should be included in the future agendas of the HEC to request Government bureaux and departments to report on the progress of the development of harbour-front related projects and issues.

3.10 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that she had hoped PlanD would give a presentation on the harbour planning principles with information on public sentiments and experience gathered in past consultations, and reference made to the constraints and opportunities for harbour-front development. She nevertheless appreciated PlanD's efforts and suggested that the presentation materials should be regularly updated to form a database on harbour-front developments.

3.11 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** commented that it might not be fair to say that the Government had not adopted an integrated approach in the past and he could testify PlanD's efforts made in this regard. The TPB's promulgation of the Vision Statement on Victoria Harbour was a case in point. Public sentiments to protect the harbour-fronts had grown stronger especially in recent years. Instead of excluding the engineers, he suggested that they should be included early in the planning process. As far as harbour reclamation plans were concerned, he reminded Members that all these plans were approved by the TPB and the Government should not be the only one to be held responsible.

3.12 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that PlanD's presentation had provided a better understanding of the existing and proposed harbour-front developments. He drew Members' attention to the following observations –

- (a) The environment we faced was ever-changing.
- (b) Sea-frontage was very limited and so the HEC should make suggestions to ensure that the harbour-front could be put to effective use and for public enjoyment at the same time.
- (c) Given the aesthetic importance of the harbour, he suggested

that PlanD's presentation materials should include more 3-D perspectives in place of aerial photos.

3.13 **Mr Bosco Fung** said that Hong Kong's harbour had undergone a long evolution from a working port to an international harbour for shipping, tourism and public enjoyment. Against this historical background, harbour planning could not start from scratch as in other places like Pudong of Shanghai. PlanD had previously commissioned the "Planning Study on the Harbour and its Waterfront Areas" to examine ways to achieve the TPB's Vision Statement and to formulate harbour planning principles and concept plans to guide the use of the harbour and its waterfront areas. The HEC could help the Government to take forward such concepts and principles.

3.14 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** observed that many working harbours in other parts of the world had successfully transformed into prominent tourist harbours. She believed that Hong Kong could also make it.

3.15 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** commented that the HEC should devote itself to making the harbour-front lively and accessible.

3.16 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the HEC should be aware of how and when to intervene in the development process of the harbour.

3.17 **Mr Patrick Lau** said that the problems and constraints associated in harbour development were not unique to Hong Kong. Many famous waterfront sites, including Singapore's Clarke Quay, the United Kingdom's Liverpool and Shanghai's Puxi had undergone a lengthy transformation. He suggested identifying Hong Kong's comparative advantage in the process of enhancing the harbour. It was also important to promote the characteristics and tourist attractions of each district.

3.18 **Mrs Mei Ng** said that district communities usually had a more "district-based" view on how the harbour-front should be enhanced, but the HEC should be open to these views. There were always a dichotomy of goals of centralization versus de-centralization, one-off improvement versus renewal/revival and functional relevance versus community-neighbourhood relevance. She opined that it was important to create a

continuous and accessible waterfront with unique characteristics instead of stereo-typed developments. The HEC should reach out to different sectors of the community in order to be able to reflect community aspirations when making recommendations on any planning proposals for the harbour.

3.19 **Mr Leslie Chen** noted the concern over the lack of integrated planning that led to an uncoordinated waterfront, and that Members had different views as to whether overall planning or planning at the district level should be carried out first. His view was that the points made by Members did not necessarily conflict with one another. A waterfront with a uniform design style might not be the best, and might risk becoming “boring”. A well-considered and planned design could preserve and enhance the diverse character along the waterfront, convey a rich vibrancy and let visitors and locals alike reflect upon the footprints of time that portrayed the complex developmental phases of the Hong Kong waterfront. He believed that it was important to respect the historical and developmental context that had shaped our waterfront today. Holistic/integrated planning should take into account the strengths and characters of each waterfront district. In his view, a “macro” overall waterfront design strategy review and “micro” district-level studies could be done in parallel. The two approaches could then be creatively combined to generate a truly comprehensive “planning strategy”.

3.20 **The Chairman** thanked Members for their views and said that the waterfront development of Hong Kong had its own history of evolution. A more forward-looking and integrated approach should be adopted in the future work of planning the harbour-front.

**Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review**

#### **Item 4 Overview of the Enhancement Works at Government Piers and Landing Facilities within the Limits of the Victoria Harbour (Paper No. 10/2004)**

4.1 **The Chairman** welcomed Messrs Anthony Loo, Lee Wai-ping and Maurice Lee to the meeting. **Mr Anthony Loo** briefed Members on the background of the study and **Mr Lee Wai-ping** presented the background and findings of the study with a PowerPoint presentation.



4.2 **The Chairman** appreciated that CEDD had commissioned the study to examine the feasibility of enhancing Government piers and landing facilities. As these facilities were important components of the harbour, their enhancement would bring improvement to the harbour-front.

4.3 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** welcomed the presentation and made the following suggestions –

- (a) That a consultancy study of all piers and landings required a strategic context based on a vision for all future harbour activities, with a clear analysis of potential users and the corresponding demand for the improvement works to the piers, landing facilities and their surrounding areas;
- (b) That as a proposal to upgrade six ferry piers amore dynamic design was recommended highlighting the stark existing architecture, and to rethink the curtain walls as they were not compatible with natural ventilation; and
- (c) To proceed with the enhancement of the six ferry piers with full steam, while expanding the consultancy study covering all marine activities.

4.4 **Professor Lam Kin-che** welcomed CEDD's efforts in examining the feasibility of enhancing the piers and landing facilities. He urged the consultant to make the best use of resources to deliver these improvements for the benefit of the community.

4.5 In response to Mr Vincent Ng's enquiries, **Mr Anthony Loo** said that the consultant had employed architects and landscape architects as sub-consultants under the consultancy study in drawing up with the preliminary enhancement schemes.

4.6 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that the consultant should adopt both a human-oriented and economics-led approach, and make better use of the rooftop of the piers, with a view to attracting people to the waterfront.

4.7 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** said that an integrated solution to improve both the external and internal aspects of the waterfront facilities were needed. The ideal was to have a touch of uniqueness for each and every pier.

4.8 **Mrs Mei Ng** opined that the enhancement proposal

should not solely focus on how best the passengers could use the piers and land facilities. The planning process should be comprehensive and take into account development of the adjoining areas of the piers. Intensive local consultation should be conducted.

4.9 **Mrs Ng** suggested the inclusion of elements of romance and humanity in the planning and design process. The piers and landing facilities should provide waiting areas for the elderly, infant care rooms, and display corners for community and charity services. They could also become venues to promulgate sports and educational events at the district level.

4.10 **Dr Alvin Kwok** proposed that the enhancement works of the piers and landing facilities should match the harbour-front enhancement works planned for the adjoining areas. He recommended that the public participation approach currently proposed for enhancement of the Central Outlying Ferry Piers should be adopted for the proposed enhancement work for the piers and landing facilities.

4.11 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** supported the suggestion that the public should be engaged in the process. He agreed that there was room to improve the appearance of the piers and suggested that the architects should pay attention to the functionality of the facilities. In addition, more leisure space should be planned for the rooftop of the piers.

4.12 Considering that there would be plenty of scope for making better use of the rooftop of the piers, **Professor Jim Chi-yung** suggested that more greening works should be done. In addition, the opening hours of the piers should be extended for the enjoyment by the pier users and the public.

4.13 **Mr Patrick Lau** expressed concern over whether the enhancement works would become yet another engineering-led product, given that many piers were previously built in connection with the major transport interchanges. He emphasized that the goal of the proposal was to beautify the waterfront facilities in order to bring more people to the harbour-front.

4.14 **Professor Lam Kin-che** said that the piers and landing

facilities could serve different functions, ranging from developing the rooftop for greening, gardens and sight-seeing purpose to dedicating the middle deck for ferry operation and the lower deck for fishing purposes.

4.15 In conclusion, **Mr Tsao Tak-kiang** thanked Members for their comments. As the aim of the paper was mainly to present the preliminary proposals on enhancing the Government piers and landing facilities for the HEC's comments, he said that more work needed to be done on the detailed design, consultation and feasibility of implementation. He assured Members that the HEC's comments would be fully considered in the process.

**CEDD**

## **Item 5 Progress Reports from the HEC Sub-committees (Papers Nos. 11-13/2004)**

### **A. Sub-committee on WDII Review (Paper No. 13/2004)**

5.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **Mr Leung Kong-yui** presented the progress report of the Sub-committee on WDII Review. The Sub-committee had held its inaugural meeting to discuss the HEC house rules and public participation in the WDII Review. He himself and some Members met with Government representatives to further discuss the public participation programme proposed by CE@H. Upon Mr Leung's invitation, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** briefed Members on CE@H's proposed framework of public participation in planning the harbour-front of Wan Chai and its adjoining areas.

5.2 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** said that the Sub-committee on WDII Review would further explore the feasibility of launching an "envisioning" public participation programme which should cost no more than \$1 million. A planning specialist would be hired by CEDD and be tasked with motivating the public to participate in the programme. He further explained that the Sub-committee on WDII Review would be ready to monitor the programme as delegated by the HEC. The outcome of the public participation programme would be reported to the HEC. With endorsement by the HEC, the Sub-committee would work out a schedule and CEDD would start to prepare the tender.

**CEDD**

5.3 **The Chairman** noted that the tender process would be

open and he trusted that CEDD would manage the process. He also expected the WDII consultant, Maunsell, to work closely with the planning specialist. **Mr L T Ma** replied that CEDD would assume an active monitoring role, and that the basic facts and constraints of the WDII Review would be presented clearly to the public to facilitate early engagement. Subject to the endorsement by the HEC, CEDD would work with the Sub-committee on WDII Review on the details of implementing the programme.

**CEDD**

5.4 **Mr Nicholas Brooke** expressed concern over the responsibility of monitoring the public participation programme. He reckoned that while the HEC should be regularly briefed on the progress of the programme, the Government department hiring the planning specialist should hold the ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the programme was cost worthy and that the specialist was able to deliver results.

5.5 **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** said he understood that although the HEC was not a funding agency, money had been earmarked for public participation programmes. He considered it appropriate that the money earmarked for the HEC should be spent thereon. He agreed with the planning specialist reporting to the CEDD in the sense that CEDD was a member of the HEC and was commissioning the planning specialist on HEC's behalf, hence the Sub-committee on WDII Review should oversee the project.

**Sub-  
committee  
on WDII  
Review**

5.6 **Mrs Mei Ng** wanted to ensure that the public participation programme would be independent. She was concerned about how the findings of the programme would be followed up, and requested CEDD to keep the HEC informed.

**CEDD**

5.7 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that the land use planning of Wan Chai and Central could not be separated and suggested an integrated land use review of Wan Chai and Central.

5.8 **Professor Jim Chi-yung** suggested that instead of focusing on Wan Chai and its adjoining areas, the HEC should conduct a public participation programme that covered the entire Victoria Harbour. Considering that only \$5 million had been earmarked for the HEC, he reckoned that the estimated cost of \$1 million for the proposed public participation programme for Wan

Chai might be disproportionately high.

5.9 In response, **Dr Ng Mee-kam** said that the public participation programme should focus on Wan Chai and its adjoining areas. If it were to cover the entire harbour, it would be under the purview of the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review. She considered the proposed public participation programme to be ground-breaking as the Government would, for the first time, work in partnership with the public and non-government organizations. If this model worked, it would form a basis for conducting public participation for other planning studies in future.

5.10 **Mr Jimmy Kwok** said that while he would not object to the idea of carrying out a public participation programme for the entire harbour, a pilot programme should be experimented at Wan Chai.

5.11 **The Chairman** briefly recapped the previous discussions leading to the proposed public participation programme under the WDII Review. While the HEC, at its first meeting, had agreed that the engineering review on the Trunk Road (Central – Wan Chai Bypass and part of the Island Eastern Corridor Link) should proceed, some Members felt that an enhanced public participation process was needed. The proposal by CE@H had been discussed at the second HEC meeting and Members agreed to refer it to the Sub-committee on WDII Review for further deliberation. He agreed with Dr Ng Mee-kam that if successful, the present public participation programme proposed for WDII could be adopted for future projects.

5.12 **Mr Thomas Tso** said that the Government's standard procedures would be followed in hiring the planning specialist to carry out the WDII public participation programme. The scope of the programme should match the geographical boundaries covered by the WDII Review. While the adjoining areas of Wan Chai could be included, the programme should not be too ambitious to the extent of attempting to cover all harbour-front areas.

5.13 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** said that while he would urge the engineering review of the Trunk Road alignment inside the

boundaries of WDII to proceed as quickly as possible, a full-scale public participation programme should be carried out separately to cover Wan Chai, Central and the entire harbour-fronts. He felt that the proposed WDII public participation programme running under an engineering review commissioned by CEDD was not a satisfactory approach to public participation.

5.14 **Mr L T Ma** explained that the WDII Review was a comprehensive planning and engineering review. The objective of the review was to decide the best alignment for the Trunk Road which at the same time would provide the maximum opportunity for land use planning. He agreed with Mr Zimmerman that the review on the alignment of the Trunk Road should proceed as quickly as possible so as to link up the “missing section” in the Trunk Road system along the north shore of the Hong Kong Island. He was also of the view that the public participation programme would help to ensure that the end product of the WDII Review, i.e. the road alignment and the land use, would be acceptable to the public.

5.15 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** disagreed with Mr Zimmerman’s suggestion that the WDII engineering review should proceed separately and prior to soliciting public views on the desirable land use of the area. That way, the road alignments in WDII would have been fixed when the public were still expressing views on the design of the harbour-front. That would render WDII yet another transport-led project and this should be avoided. The public participation programme she proposed would adopt a different approach by going through an “envisioning” process first. The engineers would then draw reference from the outcome of the “envisioning” process in designing the alignment of the Trunk Road.

5.16 **Mrs Rita Lau** said that the WDII Review had taken into account the HEC’s wish of not letting it be an engineering-led review. While the HEC had accepted that there was an urgent need for the construction of the Central – Wan Chai Bypass, a more embracing consultation strategy should be developed to better engage the public in deciding the road alignment. WDII was key to linking up the “missing section” in the Trunk Road system. As regards the land that might be formed under WDII for the construction of the Trunk Road, the public should be given an opportunity to express their views on how the

newly-formed land could best be used. Given the urgency of the WDII project, we should quickly commence the public participation programme for WDII.

5.17 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that the wording “adjoining areas” should be deleted from the title of the proposed public participation programme. He reiterated that the BEC’s vision was that the planning review for Central and Wan Chai should be conducted together and that land use of the entire harbour should be examined under a single integrated study.

5.18 **Mr Vincent Ng** felt that the HEC should decide in the first place whether or not the programme proposed by CE@H should be accepted.

5.19 **Dr Ng Mee-kam** stressed that the WDII public participation programme would be open and transparent. While the public would give views they saw fit, the HEC as a whole should work for a consensus.

5.20 **The Chairman** concluded that the majority view of the Members favoured commencing the WDII public participation programme as quickly as possible. **Mr Leung Kong-yui** supported and assured Members that while the HEC would monitor the overall programme, the actual supervisory duty would be done by the Sub-committee on WDII Review through CEDD. The Sub-committee would report the outcome of the programme to the HEC in due course.

**Sub-  
committee  
on WDII  
Review**

## **B. Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review (Paper No. 12/2004)**

5.21 Upon the Chairman’s invitation, **Mr Vincent Ng** reported that the Sub-committee on Harbour Plan Review had held its inaugural meeting where the proposed membership and ToR of the Sub-committee were confirmed subject to minor amendments. Members’ comments on the proposed house rules were submitted to the HEC for consideration. The meeting also discussed the harbour planning principles and decided to form a dedicated task group to follow up the discussion. He reported that Dr Andrew Thomson was elected as the Convenor of the task group. The Sub-committee also decided to form another task group to take forward the enhancement project at the Central

Outlying Ferry Piers, with Dr Alvin Kwok as the Convenor. Moreover, the Sub-committee had lent support to the short-term harbour-front improvement initiatives proposed at the site of the future West Kowloon Cultural District and on the hoardings of the CRIII works sites.

### **C. Sub-committee on SEKD Review (Paper No. 11/2004)**

5.22 Upon invitation by the Chairman, **Dr Chan Wai-kwan** reported that the Sub-Committee had held two meetings to discuss the public participation strategy on the SEKD Review. The Sub-Committee had also given views on the draft Consultation Digest of the Review, which was tabled at the meeting for Members' information.

5.23 **Dr Chan** said that the Sub-committee had agreed to re-name the SEKD Review as "Kai Tak Planning Review" to better reflect the study area of the Review. The public participation programme would be carried out in three stages. The first stage would focus on "vision-building" and positioning of the future Kai Tak. Concept plan options would be discussed at the second stage. Subsequently, a land use plan would be drawn up for discussion at the third stage. He emphasized that the Sub-committee on SEKD Review would reach out to the community and that relevant organizations would be invited to participate as partners in the public participation programme.

**Sub-  
committee  
on SEKD  
Review**

5.24 On the draft Consultation Digest, **Dr Chan** said that it would be important to make the document available to the public as soon as possible to engage the public in mapping out the vision for Kai Tak.

(Post-meeting note: The public participation programme was launched on 17 September 2004. The Consultation Digest had been distributed to relevant stakeholders including the HEC and uploaded to the PlanD website.)

### **Item 6 Progress Report on public enquiries received**

6.1 Upon the Chairman's invitation, **the Secretary** reported that most of the public enquiries received had either been dealt with or forwarded to the appropriate Sub-Committees for follow



up actions.

6.2 In relation to a public enquiry on the HEC website, **Dr Alvin Kwok** suggested that a hyperlink should be added to link up the HEC website with the “Our Harbour Front” website on the HPLB homepage.

**Secretary**

(Post meeting note: The hyperlink was created on 11 September 2004.)

## **Item 7 Any Other Business**

### **A. Meeting with District Councils on Hong Kong Island**

7.1 **The Chairman** said that the Secretariat had received a letter from the Chairman of the Central and Western District Council, Mr Chan Tak-chor, inviting HEC Members to meet with representatives of the four District Councils of Hong Kong Island to discuss harbour-front related issues. The meeting was scheduled to be held on 5 November 2004. **The Secretary** supplemented that the agenda of the meeting had not been received. Members were welcome to let the Secretariat know if they wished to participate in the meeting. Details of the meeting would be passed to Members once available.

**Secretary**

### **B. Conferences on Harbour Matters**

7.2 **The Secretary** reported that Mr Nicholas Brooke had suggested that consideration should be given to inviting HEC Members to take part in a conference to be held at Barcelona on 29-30 September 2004. She said that in general, members of an advisory/statutory body could attend overseas conferences related to the work of the committee. As far as financing was concerned, most bodies would not have funds to sponsor their members' participation in overseas conference. Members would pay for themselves.

7.3 **Mrs Mei Ng** cautioned that the HEC should concentrate on undertaking substantive work and achieving results in its first term. Since it would be beneficial for HEC Members to keep abreast of good harbour planning practices in other parts of the world, she suggested inviting Dr Ng Mee-kam and other

prominent speakers to share with the HEC their research on overseas practices and experience of harbour planning.

7.4 **Mr Leung Kong-yui** agreed, and suggested that Members should keep each other informed, through the Secretariat, of major conferences and seminars related to harbour planning, so that Members might choose to attend in their own capacity and share experience with other Members later on.

**Secretary**

#### **C. Other issues**

7.5 **Mr Paul Zimmerman** suggested that at future HEC meetings, the Sub-committee progress reports should be discussed immediately after confirmation of the minutes.

#### **D. Date of Next Meeting**

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. The next HEC meeting would be held on 4 November 2004 (Thursday).

**Harbour-front Enhancement Committee**

November 2004